

## Remarks

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 9, 14, 15, 21-24, 29, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Perlman (U.S. Patent 4,864,559). The Examiner also rejected claims 16, 17, 36, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of Soloway et al (U.S. Patent 5,265,092).

The Examiner objected to claims 5-8, 10-13, 18-20, 25-28, 30-33 and 38-40 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

In this amendment, applicant has incorporated the limitations of dependent claim 4 and 5 into independent claim 1, the limitations of dependent claim 18 into independent claim 14, the limitations of dependent claim 24 and 25 into independent claim 21, and the limitations of dependent claim 38 into independent claim 34.

Claims 1, 14, 21 and 34 now are equivalent to claims 5, 18, 25 and 37, rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. All of the other claims are dependent on these claims and should also therefore be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/4/07

  
Brian T. Rivers, Reg. No. 41,270  
Attorney for Applicants  
972-894-4959 Fax 972-894-5619